

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 ALICIA SANCHEZ HOLIWELL,
9 Plaintiff,
10 v.
11 C. ANDY HIGGINS, *et al.*,
12 Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00720-RSL

AMENDED ORDER REFERRING
MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF
COUNSEL

14 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's "Application for Court-Appointed
15 Counsel in Title VII Action." Dkt. # 45.

16 Generally, a person has no right to counsel in civil actions. *See Storseth v.*
17 *Spellman*, 654 F.2d 1349, 1353 (9th Cir. 1981). However, a court may under
18 "exceptional circumstances" appoint counsel for indigent civil litigants
19 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). *Agyeman v. Corrs. Corp. of Am.*, 390
20 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th Cir. 2004). When determining whether "exceptional
21 circumstances" exist, a court must consider "the likelihood of success on the
22 merits as well as the ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims *pro se* in
23 light of the complexity of the legal issues involved." *Weygandt v. Look*, 718
24 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983). Neither of these considerations is dispositive
and instead must be viewed together. *Wilborn v. Escalderon*, 789 F.2d 1328,
1331 (9th Cir. 1986).

1 Palmer v. Valdez, 560 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2009). In addition, the party seeking
2 appointment of counsel must show indigency.

3 Plaintiff has been granted *in forma pauperis* status (which the Court deems a
4 sufficient showing of indigency) and asserts that she has contacted 18-20 private attorneys
5 in an unsuccessful attempt to obtain representation.

6 With regards to the merits of plaintiff's claims, her various complaints lack a
7 straightforward narrative, bouncing between years and events in a way that makes it very
8 difficult to infer necessary causal relationships. They also highlight statements and conduct
9 that do not appear to pertain to any of the asserted claims and mention causes of action,
10 such as violations of the Sherman Act and the Anti-Money Laundering Act of 2020, that
11 appear to be implausible on the facts asserted. These shortcomings make it difficult to
12 ascertain whether plaintiff's discrimination, retaliation, and RCW 49.76 claims, which
13 form the heart of her complaints, have a reasonable chance of success. Some of these
14 claims implicate important public policies of the State of Washington, however, and their
15 elements and burdens of proof are not generally within a lay person's ken. It appears that
16 plaintiff is having difficulty articulating valid claims without a lawyer's assistance.

17 This District has implemented a plan for court-appointed representation of civil
18 rights litigants. Pursuant to Paragraph 2(c) of the Plan for *Pro Se* Litigant Representation
19 in Civil Rights Actions (as amended, effective Jan. 1, 2024), the Court refers this matter to
20 the *Pro Bono* Coordinator and the *Pro Bono* Screening Committee for further review to
21 determine if *pro bono* counsel is warranted. See General Order 07-23 (attachment).

1 The Clerk of Court is directed to renote plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel on
2 the Court's calendar for Friday, January 10, 2025, to give the Screening Committee time to
3 make its recommendation.¹
4

5
6 Dated this 3rd day of January, 2025.
7

8 
9 Robert S. Lasnik
10 United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

¹ The Screening Committee has requested an extension of time in which to complete its review.